DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 532 EA 016 983

AUTHOR	Talbert, Joan E.
TITLE	Toward an Institutional-Contingency View of School Organization.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	IFG-P-R-84-A10
PUB DATE	Apr 84
GRANT	NIE-G-83-0003
NOTE	70p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Decision Making; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Governance; *Models; *Organizational Climate; *Organizational Theories; Personnel Selection; *Power Structure; Private Schools; Public Schools; School Demography; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	San Francisco Bay

ABSTRACT

Based on an institutional-contingency view, this study focuses on ways in which public and private school sectors in six San Francisco area counties embody different organizational logistics and authority principles, including rational-legal, traditional, and local-market. Results suggest that, among other characteristics, nonreligious private schools, following the market model, generate clientele and support by emphasizing distinct educational goals, whereas religious schools, following the traditional model, stress local constituents' commitment. Conversely, rational-legal norms of public schools make social support irrelevant, demand collection and evaluation of standard, aggregated data, and support differentiated decision-making structures which limit constituent involvement. One contrast from previous findings is the suggestion that public and religious schools do not possess different organizational environments. Still, the rational-legal norms of public schools constrain their abilities to generate commitment through means used by traditional and market-oriented systems. Further, an organizing norms-governance practices "fit" is important to members' involvement. The report concludes with recommendations for research and policy options, a one-page bibliography, and two appendixes. (KS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246532

IFG

Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Project Report No. 84-A10

TOWARD AN INSTITUTIONAL-CONTINGENCY VIEW OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

Joan E. Talbert

April 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EA 016 993

Project Report No. 84-A10

TOWARD AN INSTITUTIONAL-CONTINGENCY VIEW OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

Joan E. Talbert

April 1984

Joan E. Talbert is a professor in the School of Education, Stanford University.

The research for this report was supported by funds from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-83-0003). The analyses and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of this organization.

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON EDUCATIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE

The Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance is a Research and Development Center of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and is authorized and funded under authority of Section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act as amended by Section 403 of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482). The Institute is administered through the School of Education at Stanford University and is located in the Center for Educational Research at Stanford (CERAS).

The research activity of the institute is divided into the following program areas: Finance and Economics; Politics; Law; and Organizations. In addition, there are a number of other projects and programs in the finance and governance area that are sponsored by private foundations and government agencies which are outside of the special R&D Center relationship with NIE.

Abstract

This study assesses an institutional-contingency view of school organization which emphasizes differences in authority principles and organization norms within the specialized environments of public, religious and non-religious private schools. Using data from a survey of the San Francisco Bay Area public and private schools, we assess the organizational distinctness of the three sectors and the nature of differences in organizing tendencies. We also test the notion that sectors show different patterns of correlations among organization variables and analyze correlates of a social climate index by sector and including sector as variable. We find mixed support for arguments regarding the particular nature of organizational differences among the sectors but the data do reveal an expected clustering of organization tendencies within public, religious and non-religious sectors and substantially divergent correlations among organization variables. These results suggest the potential value of an institutional-contingency model of school organization and they caution against research or educational policy which assumes that a particular governance practice has a common meaning and consequences among public, religious and non-religious private schools.

Acknowledgment

The author is grateful to Kendyll Stansbury for her assistance in preparing the data for this study.

INTRODUCTION

Based on their study of public and private school students' test performances and perceptions of school environments, Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore (1981, 1982a, 1982b) conclude that private schools produce greater achievement gains because they have stricter policies (cf. 1982b:76). This conclusion has been challanged by numerous critics, particularly in terms of inadequacies of the authors' assessment of achievement outcomes.[1] Critics have commented, as well, on inadequacies of the data for identifying school organization differences across sectors or for infering that student behavior differences are due to differences in school governance. (cf McPartland and McDill, 1982; Salganik and Karweit, 1982; Rossi and Wright, 1982: 87-88).

Critiques of the"policy effect" claim suggest that private-public differences in school climate, administrative policies, and, perhaps, student achievement are spurious due to the effects of student selection (McPartland and McDill, 1982), voluntarism (Salganik and Karweit, 1982) and/or religious community (Morgan, 1983) on shared values and commitment. One critique suggests, further, that governance patterns successful in one sector may well not be transferable to the other sector (Salganik and Karweit, 1982). These arguments suggest that private and public schools are qualitatively different social and organizational systems, whether or not different in academic productivity.

This paper aims to refine the view of public and private schools as organizationally distinct. Following Salganik and Karweit (1982), we emphasize the contrasting authority principles which organize and constrain schools in the different sectors. We propose that sector differences in program goals, climate, and administrative patterns follow from the different authority principles; and we assess these expectations

with data from a survey of principals of public, parochial and independent private schools. We also analyze a school climate measure to assess the relevance of administrative patterns, as well as program and composition variables, to climate variation within and across the sectors. This analysis explores the ideas that a particular governance strategy may be "effective" in one sector but not in another and that the traditional authority exercised in private schools is conducive to wide social support.

We emphasize that this study neither tests Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore's claim that strict policies produce better school climate and greater student achievement nor provides a better comparison of the academic and social climates of schools in different sectors. It seems that a prior empirical task is to determine in what ways public and private school sectors show different organizational logics, such that simple cross-sector comparisons of particular governance practices and other school variables would be unwarranted. Further, a better sense of the range of organizational differences across sectors will allow us to consider variables alternative to that preferred by Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore as explanations of differential "success".

SCHOOLS AND SECTORS

Different views of schools as organizations yield different expectations of the nature, and importance, of differences between the public and private school sectors. We will consider briefly some of the alternative conceptions in order to locate the institutional-contingency view which motivates the present study. We refer to the alternative views as: the social system view, the technical system view, the organizational-environment view, and the institutional system view.

In general, these conceptions of school organization portray "schools as schools" i.e., they do not consider qualitative differences among sectors. They focus on sets of variables which might distinguish sectors, but do not attend to unique conditions operating within sectors.

The social system view is represented by McPartland and McDill's (1982) argument regarding the importance of differential patterns of selection across sectors. They portray schools largely as aggregates of students which combine to effect particular social and academic climates. In this view, qualitative differences among schools may result from different demographic concentrations but not from sector differences in organizational properties or constraints. These authors call for contrasting case studies of most successful public and least successful private schools to assess the relative importance of concentrations of disadvantaged students vs. established school policies and authority granted school officials.

The technical system view is reflected in Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgores' (cf. 1982 b) argument that tighter administrative control accounts for private schools' relative success. Implicitly, the authors present a model of schools as technical production systems - producing varying quantities of student work and knowledge - which can and should be tightly co-ordinated and controlled. They assume that tight school administration is the basis of teachers' and students' commitments and achievements - and that this principle applies uniformly across sectors. They imply that levels of instructional control and officials' authority are higher in the private sector than among public schools (which they did not test in their study) and that these variables account for within-sector variation in school climate and student achievement.

What we refer to as the organization-environment view is a variant

of the technical-system view in that important school differences are attributed to variable governance structures. This view attends to external administrative structures which effect more and less complex environments among schools and across sectors. Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore (1982) suggest that the more complex environments of public schools may constrain effective local administration, i.e., tight co-ordination and control. Salganik and Karweit (1982) place government control and fragmented governance as a structural source of both reliance on legal-rational authority and low commitment in the public sector. Implicitly, school governance structures are tightly coupled to schools' academic and social climates and variable organization environments should yield different climates within, as well as across, sectors. From this view, we also would expect contrasts in social and organizational properties between independent private schools and private schools with more complex administrative and funding environments.

The institutional system view (cf. Meyer and Rowan, 1977) contrasts fundamentally with the technical system view; but as presently formulated, it also does not allow for basic sector differences. Centrally, the view regards schools' organization structures as reflecting a model of organization legitimized in their institutional environment. Further, the institutional theorists argue that schools' success depends upon a weak linkage between the administrative system and instructional activities, i.e,, low levels of instructional control - given their ambiguous goals and the importance of human relations - and upon externally validated displays of confidence and success. This view does not anticipate sector contrasts in schools' organization structures, tendencies to avoid instructional control, emphasis on social climate, or efforts to signal success.

What we refer to here as an institutional-contingency view of school organization builds upon the model outlined above in emphasizing the schools' institutional environment as the source of organizing models and success criteria. We point to the co-existence and tension among different principles of authority and organizing models in the environment of U.S. schools and argue that public, religious and non-religious independent schools embrace different available models - with resulting contrasts in goal structures, criteria of teacher and program evaluations, instructional control, and decision-making structures. The view anticipates a clustering of organizing tendencies among schools within sectors and, importantly, suggests that any particular governance strategy or practice will neither readily transfer nor have comparable consequences across sectors.

Authority Principles

The argument that private and public schools embrace different authority principles - and the nature of distinctions between the traditional and legal-rational models of organization - are developed by Salganik and Karweit (1982). This distinction between authority principles follow Weber's (1947) analysis of organizing models and tensions among traditional, legal-rational, and charismatic bases of authority. In contrasting the public and private sectors, Salganik and Karweit emphasize wider consensus as a basis for the operation of traditional authority, and the greater administrative control it allows, among private schools (1982:154). As already noted, they see government control, as well as goal conflict, undermining local commitments and thus impeding the use of traditional authority among public school heads.

While our institutional-contingency view also emphasizes the contrast between traditional and rational-legal models of organization, and the primacy of the latter within the public sector, it differs in some basic respects from Salganik and Karweit's argument. Mainly, we see the sectors' different authority principles as based in specialized institutional environments and distinguish religious from other private schools in this regard.

While all organizations must partially conform to norms of rational-legal organization dominant in modern societies, religious organizations also embrace the traditional model. Value consensus and personal commitment - even devotion - are important to the functioning of traditional organizations, while they are not assumed by or important to, legal rational organizations (except insofar as central organizational norms are shared). If we consider that religious organizations and communities comprise the legitimating environment of religious schools - by virtue of funding relations, lines of authority and hiring, and client recruitment - then we expect religious schools to conform to the traditional model of organization embraced in this institutional environment. And we would expect consensus and commitment among school members to be a central focus of organization and basis of the schools' legitimation in their institutional environment. We expect that other features of school organization, enumerated below, are based in the traditional authority model of religious schools.

We expect that non-religious private schools depart from both the traditional and rational-legal models of organization and thus represent an organizationally unique sector in U.S. education. These schools must, generally, define their markets in terms of institutional values and norms not celebrated by the organization structures or goals of

the rational-legal or religious-traditional models. Thus we consider their authority as market-based, in that they must define their own institutional environments - and assure their legitimation - according to demands not met by the dominant school sectors. They may emphasize a more decentralized, or parent-controlled, authority structure than consistent with legal-rational or traditional models and/or they may organize around educational goals de-emphasized or avoided, in rational-legal or traditional systems - such as individual development, cultural elitism, or cultural pluralism. We expect that this sector is more eclectic organizationally but distinct from public and religious private schools, particularly in the client responsiveness and local control they afford.

Clearly, the U.S. public school sector has long displayed tensions among rational-legal, religious-traditional and local-market values and principles of organization. Common school leaders of the 19th century were devoted to religious/moral education of a non-protestant sort, in conflict with both the Catholic church establishment and secular education leaders (cf Tyack and Hansot, 1982:72-83). The Catholic school system was formed around the authority model and ideology of the Church. The public school system gradually evolved around the rational-legal model of organization, purging itself of the particularism implied by religious training of any sort and developing bureaucratic administrative systems. Still, the local market principle is embodied in the institution of lay boards - though they have functioned mainly to enforce dominant local values and support administrators, rather than to represent conflicting interests or to significantly modify bureaucratic administrative principles (cf Tyack and Hansot, 1982: 218-223). The notion of community control

of schools is at odds with rational-legal norms of organization and provides an organizing logic for private schools addressing special educational interests.

In sum, the institutional-contingency view portrays public, religious and non-religious private schools as organized around rational-legal, traditional and local-market authority principles, respectively. These principles have implications for educational goals and school administration, which we outline below. While we do not regard sectors as "pure types" of organization - assuming that each partly embraces the alternative authority principles - we believe that they are significantly constrained and controlled by their unique institutional environments, yielding particular patterns of variation in organizing tendencies among schools in different sectors.

School Goals and Administrative Patterns

The institutional-contingency view centrally assumes that school goals and administrative patterns are "directed outward" - that is, they reflect and respond to the norms and values of legitimating enviroments. Thus we do not regard different organization models, or tendencies, as aimed at - or better or worse at - producing students' academic achievement. They may well have different educational consequences, though; since they emphasize different criteria of school success and establish school environments which may be unequally conducive to student involvement and learning.

The rational-legal model of organization locates authority in position, locates persons in positions on the basis of credentials or representative elections, specializes functions, uses rules to govern routine behavior, emphasizes standardized data to evaluate individual or organization behavior. Centrally, the model aims to counter tendencies toward traditional and particularistic values.

We expect that schools organized and constrained by this model: embrace multiple educational goals, but emphasize the preparation of students for academic and vocational futures; emphasize teacher credentials as the basis of hiring; assure standard curricula and student evaluations; routinely collect standardized data on student achievement and teacher performance; and have complex decision-making structures involving external and internal administrators and elected lay boards.

The traditional model of organization locates authority in persons by birthright or ordainment, emphasizes loyalty to particular values and authorities, uses ceremony and rituals to maintain members' commitments, emphasizes signs of success. Centrally, the model aims to assure value consensus and loyalty to officials.

Schools organized around this model should emphasize values education, place high primacy on social support, emphasize moral values criteria in selecting teachers and students, establish standard curricula and means of assessing student success, attend to individual student achievements and fates, and show hierarchical control of decision processes - more or less complex depending upon the number of organizational units related to the school.

The market model of organization presumes client control of organizational products and operating models and assumes competing alternatives.

We expect that schools organized under this principle emphasize goals and practices not consistent with the public or religious school models. The non-religious private schools should show less diffuse goals, with more empahsis on such values as individual development; place high primacy on social support, particularly from the parent community; emphasize professional and/or particularistic criteria for teacher selection; select students on academic or particularistic criteria and use student dismissal as a means of maintaining commitment (which traditional systems would generally avoid);

establish instructional uniqueness through definition of methods, as well as curriculum; monitor individual student progress and achievements in order to signal academic success; and show relatively simple decision structures with shared influence of parents and heads.

We assess these expectations of sector tendencies with data on public and private schools' goal emphases; constitutent involvement and support; teacher and student selection criteria; modes of instructional control; information systems; and decision-making structures. The institutional-contingency view anticipates contrasts across public, religious and non-religious schools' tendencies on these organizational variables and different patterns of school variation across sectors. In particular, we expect that organizational correlates of constituent support varies across sectors, given different criteria for school legitimation in the specialized institutional environments.

DATA

This study utilizes data collected through a survey of public and private schools, districts and teachers in six San Francisco Bay Area counties. Detailed descriptions of the school populations, samples, and response rates can be found elsewhere. Our data base is a subset of variables assessed by the school questionnaire, completed by school heads and their agents. Given high non-response rates for the school survey, we attempted to assess biases in our estimates of sector organization tendencies. This assessment is reported in Appendix I. Here we indicate our definition of school sectors and grade levels, measures used for our study of school organization, and our analysis strategy and techniques.

Sample and Sector Variables

While we do not predict specific differences in the organization of primary and secondary schools, we wished to control for sector differences in school grade-level distributions which might condition results of our analysis. Thus, we defined primary and secondary school subsamples for each sector and conducted parallel analyses for the two grade levels. (A few respondent schools do not fit our definition of primary or secondary schools and were omitted from the study sample; see Appendix II, "Classifications").

We define four school sectors for our initial assessment of sector contrasts, - distinguishing between Catholic schools under diocesan control and independent religious schools - in order to determine whether the organizational or the institutional (religious) environment is more predictive of organization tendencies. The grade level and sector designations yield eight subsamples: primary public (N = 62), primary parochial (diocesan-based Catholic schools)(N = 67), primary religious independent (N = 14), primary non-religious independent (N = 18), secondary public (N = 41), secondary parochial (N = 4), secondary religious independent (N = 9), secondary non-religious independent (N = 8). After the initial analysis of means across four sectors, the religious schools were defined as a single sector for subsequent analyses.

Given small Ns for the secondary private sectors, only the primary school subsamples are used for separate-sector analyses (the comparison of means and a comparison of sector-specific correlations). When sector is treated as a variable for analysis, parallel analyses are carried out for primary and secondary school aggregates with sector defined by dummy variables for public, religious and non-religious, independent schools. In spite of an aggregate secondary school N of 62, one should keep in mind that estimates for the sector variables are likely to be unstable, given the small NS representing private school categories.

Measures

Apart from the measures of decision-making structure and teacher and student selectivity, our measures are based on school heads' responses to check lists designed to identify particular emphases or administrative practices. Thus, most of our indicators of school variables are dummy variables or sums of dummy variables.

This approach has advantages and disadvantages compared to the more common scaling approach to organization variables. It allows more straightforward reporting of salient organization features, avoiding reference group comparisons and uneven standards often generated by a demand for quantitative responses about administrative practices. On the other hand, categoric responses cannot top quantitative differences in reported practices, e.g., the frequency of schools' measuring of student achievement or the extensivement of use of achievement data across classrooms. We believe that the categoric response approach is preferable for studies such as this, which seek to tap a school's organization as apprehended by its environment, but not preferable for research concerned with the inner workings of the school.

Similarly, we prefer organization measures based on heads' definitions of school features - an "institutional" approach, which taps officials' views of their organization as opposed to a survey approach which can provide more accurate measures of internal school processes. In sum, our approach to measuring features of school organization is designed especially to capture variation salient and significant to the schools' many constituencies.

Our definition and measures of school sector are noted above. We also analyze straightforward measures of school composition: total student enrollment (from official records) and percent minority students (from respondent reports). Organization indices used in multivariate analyses (underlined

below) and their component measures (analysed in Table 1) are as follows:

Program emphasis is represented by an index of goal diffuseness, the sum of 9 dummy variables representing alternative, broad school goals and by three measures of program focus: a) College or vocational preparation (sum of 2 dummy variables), b) basic skills and ethical values (sum of 3 dummy variables) c) individual development (sum of 2 dummy variables concerning social/cultural and self-esteem development).

The organizational privacy of the schools' social-system is represented by a climate index, the sum of 4 dummy variables representing internal and external support. These focuses are represented, respectively, by measures of a) internal system (sum of 2 dummy variables concerning the classroom-relevant variables of teacher commitment and student discipline) and b) external system (sum of 2 dummy variables concerning parent involvement and general student morale).

Teacher recruitment standards are represented by a selectivity index (ranging from 5 to 45), the sum of scores on 12 possible criteria from 0-5, and by measures of emphases on a) moral integrity (sum of 3 items concerning religion and lifestyle) b) rational-legal criteria (sum of 4 items concerning credentials c) professional criteria (sum of 2 items concerning experience and philosophy of education and d) ascribed characteristics (sum of two items indicating gender or affirmative action concerns).

Student selection standards are represented by a selectivity index (ranging from 2 to 13), the sum of scores on 10 possible cirteria of student selection rated in importance from 0-2, and by measures of emphases on a) academic criteria (2 items), b) moral criteria (2 items), c) personal/social criteria (3 items), d) particularistic criteria (2 items concerning relatives' school attendance and recommendations) and 2) ascribed characteristics (1 affirmative-action item).

Instructional control is represented by a control index, the sum of 4 dummy variables concerning school practices of a) methods control (school-wide use of particular teaching methods, b) curriculum control (school-wide use of a particular curriculum), c) student progress review, school-wide and d) student dismissal for poor academic work.

Information control is represented by an index of accounting requirements, a 0-11 scale based on the sum of responses regarding information collected for a public agency and by categories of information collected (whether or not required by an agency): a) achievement test data (1 item), b) admissions/prizes monitoring (2 items concerning students' honors and admissions to other educational institutions) d) climate monitoring (2 items concerning systematic surveys of students' and parents' attitudes) d) client monitoring (4-point scale summing b and c, above, used in multivariate analysis) and e) Teacher performance monitoring (1 item).

Locus of decision-making data are summarized by a complexity index (ranging from 50 to 122), the sum of ratings of influence (0-5 scale) for 6 constituent category (administrative system office, principal/head, pastor/rabbi, faculty, local school governing board, and parent group) across 5 decision areas (adopting a major change in curriculum, hiring a new teacher, dismissing a teacher, determining student admissions policies, and defining the school budget). We consider separate measures of influence for each constituent category (influence ratings summed over the decision areas as a proportion of total influence) and separate complexity measures (as per above) for each decision domain. For multivariate analyses we employ indices of: hierarchical control, the sum of school or religious officials' influence ratios across

decision areas; and, lay control, the sum of board and parent influence ratios across decision areas (the residual of the two indices representing faculty influence).

Analysis

Our analysis of these data aims to assess the institutional-contingency arguments regarding particular contrasts in the organization tendencies of public, religious and non-religious private schools and the distinctness of the sectors' organizing patterns. We also analyse school variation in reported support (our climate index) within and across sectors in order to consider the relevance of organization variables to social-system support, any sector differences in correlates of climate, and any independent advantages or disadvantages associated with the different authority principles embraced by the school sectors.

In the first stage of analysis, we consider: a) tests of differences in sector means on detailed measures of organization variables b) correlations of sector dummy variables with the organization indices and student composition variables c) multiple discriminant analysis of sector variables in relation to the set of organization indices and d) sector-specific correlation matrices of the organization indices. These empirical assessments provide different perspectives on the issue of sector contrasts in school organization. We rely mainly on results obtained for primary schools, given problems associated with very small samples of secondary private schools; though we report the correlational data, and results of the discriminant analysis, for secondary schools as well.

We use multiple discriminant analysis as an overall assessment of sector distinctness, rather than as a technique for estimating the weights of particular organization variables in making the contrasts.

The latter is shown by both the differences in sector means and the matrix of sector x organization index correlations. A linearized discriminant function is not reported for this reason and because the data warrant use of within convariance matrices, rather than a pooled matrix which would yield variable weightings for the three-sector discimination.

In the second stage of analysis, addressing school climate variation, we consider a) sector-specific correlations of the climate index with organization and composition variables and b) regression analyses of the climate measure on the organization and composition variables. We emphasize that our index of school climate is extremely crude in its reliance on heads' reports, its reliance on global assessments of social support (teachers' "dedication", students' "discipline", student "morale" and parent "involvement"), and its simple ordinal scale character. Thus, results should be read with caution and used to direct further research rather than to reach conclusions.

ORGANIZATIONAL DIFFERENCES AMONG SECTORS

Our assessment of sector differences in school organization considers a) differences in means across four school sectors on organizational indices and their component measures; b) correlations of sector dummy variables with composition variables and organizational indices; and c) multiple discriminant analysis of school sectors in terms of the organizational variables. In the first analysis, we assess the institutional-contingency expectations of qualiative and quantitative differences in the organization of public, religious and non-religious private schools. A distinction between "parochial" and religious independent schools allows us to assess in what respects religious authority, as opposed to the schools' organizational context, appears to influence internal organizational patterns. The second analysis summarizes sector contrasts in school organization and considers possible influences of school composition variables. The third analysis provides an overall assessment of the organizational distinctness of the school sectors.

Nature of Sector Contrasts

The data reported in Table 1 show mixed support for the institutional-contingency argument. This is the case for both lines of sector contrasts and the nature of differences among schools.

Lines of Contrast. The two categories of religious schools show similar patterns vis-a-vis public and non-religious private schools for most internal organizational variables (program emphasis, social system primacy, teacher and student recruitment, and instructional control) but different patterns for variables influenced most directly by external organizational arrangements

(information control and locus of decision making).

Exceptions to this generalization are that parochial schools show somewhat higher levels of teacher selectivity than independent religious schools and substantially higher levels of student selectivity (placing greater emphasis on moral criteria and particularistic criteria, such as prior enrollment of relatives). The only exceptions with regard to information control and decision-making patterns are that achievement test data are uniformly collected across sectors (thus showing no differences between the two religious sectors) and the relative influence of parents in school decisions is comparable for the religious sectors and intermediate between the public and non-religious private sectors, while no significant difference in faculty influence is shown across the two religious sectors and the public sector.

Where religious independent schools depart from the parochial pattern, they generally appear to operate like non-religious independent schools. Compared to public and parochial schools both sectors show substantially lower accounting requirements, lower levels of climate monitoring through surveys, lower levels of teacher monitoring, and intermediate attention to individual student achievements. Further, both show higher relative influence of the school head and intermediate levels of lay board influence vis-a-vis public and parochial schools. However, the non-religious independent schools show more influence for both faculty and parents than do religious independent schools; while the religious independent schools show greater influence of pastors/priests, though less than for parochial schools.

Thus, whether one locates a line of contrast between religious and non-religious private schools or between parochial and independent private schools depends partly on which set of organizational

variables is emphasized. However, if the decision-making data are summarized according to three categories - hierarchical control (considering external and internal administrators and pastors/priests as organization officials), lay control (considering school boards and parents as external to the organization authority system) and faculty control - the religious schools show comparable patterns vis-a-vis public and non-religious private schools. Both religious sectors appear to have more hierarchical control (.59 and .55 vs .49 and .50 for public and non-religious schools, respectively) and less lay control (.25 and .27 vs .34 and .31). With this representation of the schools' decision-making structures, a line of organizational contrast is more clearly between the religious and non-religious private sectors.

Subsequent analyses maintain only the public/religious/non-religious private sector distinctions and use the summary codings of decision-making structure. One should keep in mind that some organization-based differences within the religious sector are masked: higher teacher and student selectivity among parochial schools; greater client monitoring (of student achievements and client attitudes) by parochial schools; and more complex decision-making processes within parochial schools, with greater decision-autonomy of heads of religious independent schools.

Nature of sector differences. The data are consistent with some expectations derived from an institutional-contingency view of school organization. Namely: the private schools place greater emphasis on social climate (or broad constituent support), with non-religious schools more heavily emphasizing parent support; private schools are more highly selective of teachers, with religious schools emphasizing moral criteria and the non-religious schools emphasizing professional and ascribed characteristics;

non-religious private schools rely more on student dismissal to maintain program success; independent private schools show lower accounting requirements and private schools generally are more attentive to individual student fates, while public schools emphasize aggregate client data; and religious schools show more hierarchical decision structures, while non-religious private schools show greater parent influence.

Some of our expectations are not borne out by the data. Given our measure of goal diffuseness, public schools show lower- rather than higher - levels of diffuseness. Administrators tended to report no program emphasis rather than multiple emphases, given significantly lower levels of reported emphasis for each of the response categories - including that relevant to continuing education or work, which we expected to be particularly indicated. The goal ordering for the religious and non-religious sectors is as expected, with the former very high on basic skills and ethical values and the latter somewhat higher on individual development.

No sector patterns are revealed by the data on instructional control, except with regard to student dismissal. Control is slightly, but not significantly, higher among private independent schools. The tendencies to standardize the curriculum and to monitor student progress appear comparably high across sectors, though means and extent of control may vary. School control of teaching methods appears comparably infrequent across the sectors.

A relative emphasis among public schools on achievement test data is not shown, given apparently routine use of such tests by schools in all sectors. Counter to our expectation, teacher

performance monitoring appears more routine among parochial than public schools - though this may not be the kind of standardized evaluation procedure we expect in the public sector. The overwhelming tendency of parochial school heads to report teacher monitoring is not clearly interpretable; it may reflect a bureaucratic institution, a common means of instructional control, or an emphasis on teacher-head communication in this sector. Given the substantially lower level of teacher monitoring reported among religious independent schools - where we expect comparable professional and social relations between teachers and heads - we suspect that parochial school bureaucracies mandate and enforce teacher performance evaluations, apparently more commonly than among public schools. The nature of this cross-sector difference - as an aspect of the schools' information system or a means of instructional control - should be investigated in further research.

Finally, the parochial schools appear to have more complex decision-making processes than public schools, in spite of their greater hierachical authority. This means that across budget, curricular, staff and student selection decisions the total reported influence of various officials, faculty and parents is greater-on average - among parochial than public schools.

Apparently, the "privateness" of parochial schools and their traditional authority principle combine to effect wide involvement in school decisions, with hierachical control maintained. However, the summary measure doesn't capture the greater differentiation within the public sector of decision processes across domains. Specifically, the component data show curricular decisions to be more complex within the public sector; while other decision domains apparently are more specialized than they are in the parochial systems.

Sector Differences in Composition and Organization

The correlations reported in Table ? summarize sector differences in school organization and in average size and minority enrollments. They also allow comparison between primary and secondary school samples.

As we have already noted, the organizational variables analyzed in this study discriminate among the public, religious and non-religious private sectors - with the exception of instructional control (or reported school control of curriculum, methods and review of student progress). The contrasts observed for primary schools appear also for secondary schools, with few exceptions.

In terms of goal diffuseness, the public secondary schools appear intermediate between religious and non-religious private schools - with religious schools still substantially higher on the diffuseness index. In terms of the climate, or social support, index; public secondary schools are less distinctly low relative to religious schools than appeared for primary schools; and the public and religious sectors are comparable on the client monitoring index. In terms of decision structure, the levels of hierarchical control do not distinguish secondary-school sectors, while levels of lay and faculty influence yield contrasts between the public and non-religious private sectors - with lay influence substantially higher and faculty influence substantially lower within the public sector.

Minority composition does not distinguish the sectors except for the secondary school sample, where non-religious private schools show significantly lower levels of minority enrollment. The size variable distinguishes public from both private sectors, particularly at the secondary level. Since this variable could provide an interpretation of differences in organization variables, alternative to the authority-base argument, we should attend to size correlates within the school samples.

We note that size is negatively associated with goal diffuseness; but this relationship is shown only for primary schools, and the correlation is much smaller than the negative correlation of the public sector with goal diffuseness. School size is positively associated with accounting requirements among the primary and secondary schools and with client monitoring among secondary schools, which could account for the public-nonreligious private contrast on this organization variable - but not the comparable levels shown for the public and religious sectors. Finally, decision-making structures are associated with size, particularly among the secondary schools: total enrollment is positively correlated with lay influence and negatively correlated with hierarchical control and faculty influence. Given the relative sizes of correlations involving the sector and enrollment variables, this pattern is more likely to reflect than to explain sector differences in decision-making structures. Of course, correlations tell us nothing of causation; but the data relevant to school size help us to rule out this variable as an explanation of observed differences in sector organization.

Sector Distinctness

Multiple discriminant analysis of the three school sectors in relation to our organizational indices (those variables included in Table 2, except composition variables and the faculty influence measure) supports a view of public, religious and non-religious private schools as organizationally distinct. Three findings are relevant. First, a test of the homogeneity of within-sector covariance matrices yielded a chi square value of .07. Further, as shown in table 3, both the summary measures of within- vs. between-sector variation and the rates of classification success indicate the clustering of organizational tendencies within sectors.

The data show slightly less overall difference between the public and religious sectors than between the public and non-religious private sectors or the religious and non-religious private sectors. This is in spite of greater school variation within the non-religious private sector (as indicated by the generalized squared distances shown from this sector to each sector). Nevertheless, the cross-sector distinctness appears substantial; and 84 per cent of public schools, 96 per cent of religious schools and 93 per cent of non-religious private schools can be correctly classified with information on the 8 indices of school organization.

Additional perspective on the organizational distinctness of public, religious, and non-religious private school sectors is provided by comparing correlations among organizational variables across the sectors. As summarized in table 4, this comparison reveals rather different patterns of organizational variation within the three sectors. Notably, of the 7 significant correlations among organization variables observed within the public school sector, only 2 are observed for both private sectors and 3 are unique to the public sector. Such differences caution one against analyses which aggregate schools from different sectors and against the assumption that a particular organization policy or practice will have comparable effects among schools in different sectors.

The nature of differences observed here suggests ways in which the unique institutional environments of the sectors condition the consequences (correlates) of particular organization practices. However, it is also worth noting that within each sector hierarchical control appears to trade off with lay influence and external accounting requirements tend to produce client monitoring (presumably schools' efforts, under scrutiny, to signal success and

generate local support). Also, except among non-religious private schools, goal diffuseness is associated with wide social support (the climate index) and instructional control is associated with goal diffuseness. Apart from these common tendencies, patterns shown for public schools are distinct from those for the private schools sectors.

The extent of hierarchical control appears to be a more critical distinction among private than among public schools - high levels distinguishing schools with lower levels of faculty influence in decision-making and, within the non-religious sector, schools with higher levels of instructional control. Rational-legal structures and norms apparently constrain school officials' autonomy in the public sector. However, we observe a strong negative association of lay and faculty influence in this sector - indicating mainly the potential of public school boards to constrain teachers' role in decision-making (compare standard deviations for board and parent influence shown in Table 2).

The association of teacher selectivity and accounting requirements among public schools may reflect the greater hiring autonomy of large primary schools with special programs - with capacity for hiring teachers not allocated through routine processes and with greater accounting demands. This inference is based on an observed sector-specific correlation of teacher selectivity with school size of .26 (and -.25 with distinct size, challenging a simple 'district-slack' interpretation). The correlation of teacher selectivity with instructional control among religious schools points to the capacity for tight internal management of religious schools; while public schools may need to sacrifice autonomy in order to gain control over the important domain of teacher selection.

Finally, the correlation of instructional control and the climate measure among public schools (shown also for public secondary schools: r =.40, p = .08) may reflect institutional demands for tighter program definition in the public sector. Importantly, the pattern is not shown among religious and non-religious private schools (r = .02 and .17, respectively); nor are there differences in sector means on the control variable across sectors, as we have shown. Thus, while the instructional control variable cannot account for observed sector differences in reported constituent support - as the Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore conclusion leads us to expect - it does appear important with the public school sector.

We proceed with further cross-and within- sector analysis of the climate index, since this appears to be an important school variable mediating student achievement and/or reflecting the legitimacy accorded a school. Clearly our measure of this variable is crude - representing school heads' reports on the constributions to school success of students', teachers' and parents' commitments - and more intensive cross-sector analysis of this variable is required before firm conclusions can be drawn.

CLIMATE VARIATION WITHIN AND ACROSS SECTORS

This analysis is concerned mainly with the question of whether not a) sectors show similar organization and composition correlates of climate and b) organizational differences account for the contrast on the climate variable shown for public and private schools, particularly public vs religious schools (see Tables 1 and 2). In addressing these issues, we examine both sector- specific

correlates of our climate index and results of regression analyses for primary and secondary schools including dummy variables for sectors.

Table 5 shows sector-specific correlations of the climate measure with organization and composition variables analyzed in this study. The cross-sector patterns are similar in that teacher selectivity, accounting requirements, client monitoring, and decision-making structure are uniformly unrelated to the school climate measure. As we have noted, instructional control appears to support - or reflect - school climate in the public sector only. Goal diffuseness is positively related to climate in all but the non-religious primary sector (where the relationship is .26 but not statistically significant). Importantly, neither school size nor minority representation is related to climate in the public sector, with the latter only weakly negatively related to climate among parochial schools. These variables are strongly related to climate in the non-religious private sector, with size showing a positive association - and minority composition a negative association - with reported constituent commitment. These findings raise doubts about standard organizational explanations of superior commitment among private school constituents.

The regression analyses reported in Table 6 are not entirely warranted, given the sector contrasts we have just noted. In particular, the size and minority composition effects are produced partly by their importance in the non-religious private sector; and the local importance of instructional control among public schools is lost in aggregate analysis. Nonetheless, they allow some net assessment of any sector effects, independent of organization and composition differences.

The overwhelming predictor of reported constituent support is multiple school goals, regardless of other organization variables and sector. This finding may well reflect the capacity of schools with wide support to expand their domains of education; but it is inconsistent with a view that more focused goals, e.g., emphasis on the basics, is conducive to constituent commitment.

For both primary and secondary schools we see positive regression effects for size and negative effects for minority enrollment, controlling for the organization variables. These findings are consistent with the view that minority enrollments generally are stressful to a school's social climate (or provide a perception of disharmony in the school environment) but inconsistent with the notion that smaller school size may account for the advantage of private schools (cf. Salganik and Karweit, 1982: 158,159).

Apart from these regression effects, the primary and secondary sectors show different results. Among the primary schools, client monitoring is a negative predictor of school climate, perhaps reflecting residual tendency of schools to use parent and/or student surveys when school support is low (the correlations involving client monitoring, goal diffuseness and climate shown in Table 2 reveal a lower-than-expected positive association of client monitoring and climate). Further, the data shown an independent effect of religious school sector, suggesting that the traditional authority principle is conducive to supportive school climate, apart from organizational patterns. This effect is consistent with our institutional-contingency view and could probably be accounted for by variables focused on the social systems of schools.

Among secondary schools, the instructional control and hierarchical control variables show positive independent associations with climate. These findings reflect, in the first instance, the pattern noted

earlier for public schools (given the large sub sample N for this sector) and, in the second instance, the weaker (than noted for primary schools) public-religious contrast on climate and the capacity of hierarchical control to account for climate variation after other organization and composition variables are controlled. One might interpret these results as supportive of Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore's argument regarding stricter school policies among religious schools. However, neither instructional control nor hierarchical control is associated with the sector variables in the secondary school sample (see Table 2), and neither variable correlates significantly with climate within the religious sector ($r = .42$, $p = .18$; $r = .02$, $p = .95$, respectively).

Clearly, further analysis of school climate is necessary to sort out the unique and common factors which generate, or undermine, constitutent support of public, religious and non-religious private schools. This assessment suggests both that unique factors are important, i.e, that one cannot assume public schools generate commitment in the same ways that religious schools do and that - at least among primary schools - religious schools are more routinely able to assure wide constituent support. We suspect that the traditional authority model is particularly conducive to constituent support - in contrast to both the rational-legal and market models.

DISCUSSION

We have argued for a view of school organization and governance which recognizes the specialized institutional environments - and their dominant organization models and norms - which distinguish the public, religious, and non-religious private school sectors.

Available theory on school organization and organizational explanations of Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore's data do not allow for such qualitative differences across the sectors. Our analysis was motivated by a concern that basic organization differences might significantly condition the effects of public school policy aimed at "equalizing" sector differences in school governance, climate and student achievement.

Summary

Our data show lines of organizational distinctness across public, religious, and other private schools consistent with the claim that the sectors follow different models and norms of organization.

Following what we have called a market model, non-religious private schools appear to generate a clientele and support by emphasizing educational goals not championed in the other sectors, selecting teachers with consistent professional and personal characteristics, dismissing poor students, and following a model of parent/head control.

Consistent with a traditional model of organization, religious schools tend to select students and teachers on moral criteria, emphasize local constitutents' commitment and involvement, avoid student dismissal relative to other private schools and attend to individuals' successes, and maintain hierarchical control with wide constituent involvement in decision making. They also appear to emphasize a relatively wide range of educational goals, including moral education.

Following rational-legal norms, public schools - as we know - are constrained against student selection and dismissal and against teacher selection on particularistic criteria. The norms also suggest that social support and involvement are irrelevant to the business of schools -

or at least secondary to conerns over technical and budgetary matters.[2] Thus lower primacy and quality of schools' social systems in this sector is not surprising. Rational-legal norms also constrain the sector from signalling success with reference to outstanding students, teachers or schools and demand collection and evaluation of standard, aggregated data. Further, they support differentiated decision-making structures, which limit widespread constituent involvement in school decisions.

Importantly, the different organization models appear not to yield different levels or foci of instructional control, suggesting that the academic programs of religious schools are not more tightly controlled - as Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore conclude from their study. Neither do public and religious schools appear to have different organizational environments, at least in terms of accounting demands - challenging a view that external control structures significantly affect internal organization. Also, demographic compositions (at least as represented by minority enrollments) do not distinguish schools by sector; nor is this variable associated with reported school climate, except among the non-religious private schools - challenging the view that demographic composition is a critical determinant of schools' social and academic climates.

Implications for School Social Systems

We suggest that the rational-legal norms which dominate the environment of public schools constrain their capacity to generate commitment through means routinely used by schools following traditional or market models of organizing. This does not mean that commitments must be low among public schools constituencies. It means only that the public schools must generate involvement and commitment through governance strategies and practices legitimized by rational-legal organizing norms or the norms themselves

must be modified to accommodate strategies consistent with the traditional or market models.

Our institutional-contingency view of school organization is concerned centrally with constituents' ideas about their own involvement with the schools and the way schools should operate. In line with Amitai Etzioni's (1961) classic analsysis of compliance under different types of power systems (coercive, remunerative, and normative) we suggest that a fit between the organizing norms legitmized by school constituents and governance practices is important to members' commitment and involvement. We expect, for example, that a merit pay system in religious schools would undermine, rather than support, the involvement of constituents oriented toward a traditional model of organization; similarly, selection of teachers according to lifestyle standards or emphasis on moral education and school rituals in public schools would alienate constituents who expect rational-legal modes of organization. Our data showing sector distinctness in organization tendencies and some sector differences in correlates of reported social climate suggest the value of pursuing this line of argument.

Suggested Research and Policy Options

Further research would focus more intensively on constituent beliefs about proper school governance, governance strategies and practices, and constituent involvement. For theoretical purposes, one would want to study contrasts in school organization within each sector in order to test the arguments that a) organization norms vary by sector and b) congruent practices yield higher commitments. Cross national comparisons would also be useful for identifying cultural, historical and system factors which might condition sector organization contrasts. For

public policy purposes, one would want to test the argument for different segments of the public school system (constrasting schools on region, urban/rural, and socio-economic base).

We believe that our argument, with further substantiation, has important implications for public school policy and practice. Most basically, if agendas shift to more centrally emphasize constituent support - as a goal or as a means toward student achievement - the conception of education governance might properly shift to that of generating commitment (in addition to managing budgets and programs), in contrast to evaluating student and teacher behavior. We note that such a conception is consistent with the general view of schools as institutional organizations. The institutional-contingency view has more specific implications for alternative directions of change in the public school sector.

In our view, public school policy and leadership have the capacity to support greater "calculative" involvement consistent with the rational-legal model of school organization, to support a shift towards the traditional mode of organization and greater normative involvement, or to support a shift toward more coercive power and alienative involvement of local constituents.

The last option could result from law-and-order demands, which place primacy on negative sanctions not likely to be legitimized widely by constituents with calculative (or normative) involvement with the schools. Strategies for control, in the law-and-order vein, are likely to shift public schools farther away from the models of normative community offered by the religious school sector.

The other alternatives are more promising, but we hypothesize that a) the rational-legal strategies would be more generally effective

in the short run, b) the variables of region, urban/rural and socio-economic base are likely to condition the dominance of rational-legal norms among local school constituents, thus either strategies would have uneven effects;and c) incongruent strategies are not likely to be effective and a "mixed approach" may be counter-productive of constituent support.

Strategies for generating commitment consistent with the rational-legal models are, not surprisingly, those which tend to be proposed and adopted in the public sector. They include merit-pay scales, which offer remuneration to teachers or students; vocational programs, based on school business alliances, which offer clear payoffs to educational work; and so on.

Further, if schools are to thrive in the rational-legal environment created by business organizations, "advertising campaigns" might be launched to generate involvement based on evidence of individual and social benefits of education. Data are available to show, e.g., credential-occupation linkages;associations of education with productive parenting, sexual satisfaction; and the like. Clearly the public educationsystem has not capitalized on its merits as judged by rational-legal organizing norms. It has been the recipient of demands for achievement - production data and strict assessments of education benefits, but it has not been allowed to - or encouraged to - take responsibility for many of the real benefits to society and individuals of the systems' educational production. School governance strategy consistent with the rational-legal model would use such wide-ranging data to generate support for the goods of education.

The second strategy suggested-that of shifting toward the traditional model of organization and normative control - would entail socializing students, teachers, and administrators to beliefs in the importance of

school community and the value of teacher and student dedication, regardless of remuneration, and to ways of managing social systems. Such strategy would require a shift in criteria for evaluating schools, which would emphasize social climate, and probably would require decentralized government structures, development of good measures of the quality of school social systems, and support of traditions and rituals which have meaning in the local community.

To suggest that the last strategy is not feasible is to place the schools firmly in the institutional domain of rational-legal organizations. Most likely, the public school system, taken as a national aggregate, includes many local communities in which the traditional organization model is dominant. Nevertheless, they increasingly represent deviant cases; and strategies designed to boost commitment under rational-legal norms should benefit the vast majority of U.S. public schools.

FOOTNOTES

1 See, for example, the papers published in two issues of Sociology of Education devoted to airing controversy surrounding the Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore report: volume 55, number 2/3 (April/July 1982) and volume 56, number 4 (October 1983).

2 Only recently, with research evidence and education commentators suggesting an instrumental link between school "climate" and student achievement, has concern over the schools' social and normative environment been legitmized in the public sector.

REFERENCES

Coleman, J.,T.Hoffer and S.Kilgore
1981 Public and Private Schools. Report submitted to the National Center for Educational Statistics. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

1982a High School Achievement: Public, Catholic and other-Private Schools Compared. New York: Basic Books.

1982b "Cognitive outcomes in public and private schools". Sociology of Education 55:65-76.

Etzioni, A.
1961 A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations: On Power, Involvement and Their Correlates. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

McPortland, J.M.and E.L.McDill
1982 "Control and differentiation in the structure of American education." Sociology of Education 55:77-88.

Meyer J.and B.Rowan
1977 "Institutionalized organizations: formal structures as myth and ceremony". American Journal of Sociology 83:340-363.

Morgan, W.R.
1983 "Learning and student life quality of public and private school youth". Sociology of Education 56:187-202.

Rossi, P.H.and J.D.Wright
1982 "Best schools - better discipline or better students? A review of High School Achievement". American Journal of Education 91:79-89.

Salganik, L.H.and Karweit, N.
1982 "Voluntarism and governance in education". Sociology of Education 55:152-161.

Tyack, D.and E.Hansot
1982 Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980. New York: Basic Books.

TABLE 1

Means and Standard Deviations of School Organization Variables for Four School Sectors - Primary Schools

School Variable		SECTOR Public N =62	Parochial N =67	Independent Religious N = 14	Independent Non-Religious N = 18
Program Emphasis					
Goal diffuseness Index	*	3.9(1.3)	5.7(1.2)	5.8 (1.4)+	4.7(1.3)
College/Voc. preparation	*	.1(.4)-	.3(.6)-	.4 (.7)	.4(.6)
Basic Skills/Ethical Values	*	1.7(.6)	2.9(.3)	2.9 (.4)	1.3(.7)
Individual Development	*	1.2(.8)	1.5(.6)	1.5 (.7)	1.7(.6)
Social System Primacy					
Climate Index (broad support)	*	2.9(1.1)	3.4(.9)	3.4 (1.2)	3.4(1.3)
Internal (teacher and student discipline)		1.4(.6)	1.6(.6)	1.8 (.4)	1.4(.5)
External (community support)	*	1.5(.7)-	1.7(.6)	1.6 (.9)	1.9(.9)
Administrative Patterns					
Teacher Recruitment Standards					
Selectivity Index	*	26.4(5.2)	32.3(6.1)	30.9 (8.8)	30.1(5.6)
Moral Integrity	*	4.0(1.7)	9.5(2.6)	9.6 (4.2)+	4.3(1.1)
Rational/Legal credentials		10.7(3.2)-	10.8(2.6)	10.3 (3.7)	11.0(3.8)
Professional (experience)		8.3(1.4)	8.5(1.4)	7.9 (1.8)	8.9(1.3)
Ascribed characteristics (Aff. Action)	*	2.7(1.6)	3.2(2.0)+	2.8 (2.0)	4.3(1.7)
Student Selection Standards					
Selectivity Index	*		7.7(2.3)	6.4 (2.2)	6.4(2.4)
Academic			2.9(1.0)	3.0 (1.1)	2.6(1.3)-
Moral	*		1.9(1.0)	1.1 (1.0)	o (o)
Personal/Social			1.9(1.1)	2.1 (.8)	2.0(1.3)
Particularistic (relatives)	*		1.8(.8)	1.2 (.7)	1.9(.8)
Ascribed characteristics (Aff. Action)	*		.4(.6)	.3 (.5)+	.8(.7)-

TABLE 1 (Cont'd)

		SECTOR			
					Independent
		Public	Parochial	Religious	Non-Religious
		N = 62	N = 67	N = 14	N = 18
Instructional Control					
Control Index		2.0(.7)	2.0(.7)	1.9(.8)	2.3(1.1)+
Methods		.3(.5)	.3(.5)	.2(.4)	.4(.5)
Curriculum		.8(.4)	.8(.4)	.5(.5)	.6(.5)
Student progress		.9(.4)	.7(.5)	.9(.4)	.8(.5)+
Student dismissal	*	0(.1)	.2(.4)-	.3(.5)	.5(.5)
Information Control					
Accounting requirements (index)	*	4.8(2.4)	4.9(2.4)	2.5(1.9)+	2.0(1.4)
Achievement test data		1.0(.1)	1.0(0)	1.0(0)	.9(.2)
Admissions/prizes monitoring	*	.3(.6)	1.3(.8)	.7(.6)	.7(.8)
Climate monitoring (surveys)	*	1.5(.8)	1.1(.8)	.7(.8)	.6(.7)
Teacher performance monitoring	*	.8(.4)	1.0(.2)	.6(.5)+	.6(.5)
Locus of Decision Making					
Complexity Index	*	79.4(12.0)	88.9(14.0)	78.3(14.0)	71.2(12.3)
Administration (ratio)		13(.06)	.12(.05)	.11(.06)	.13(.12)
Board (ratio)	*	.26(.05)	.15(.04)	.18(.05)+	.19(.05)
Postor (ratio)	*	.11(.03)	.19(.05)+	.13(.07)	.07(.01)
Principal/head (ratio)	*	.25(.05)	.28(.04)+	.31(.06)	.30(.09)
Faculty (ratio)	*	.16(.04)	.16(.03)	.18(.04)-	.19(.06)
Parents (ratio)	*	.08(.02)-	.10(.03)	.09(.02)	.12(.04)

*In the first column indicates 2 statistically significant difference of means between at least two of the four sectors compared
( ) indicates standard deviation
+ or - adjacent to numbers in each column indicates the direction of correction suggested by our analysis of survey response bias (see Appendix I).

TABLE 2

Correlation Matrices of School Sector, Dummy Variables, Enrollment Variables, and Organizational Indices for Primary and Secondary Schools Separately.

	Public	Religious	Indep.	Percent minority	Tot. Enroll.	Goal Diff	Teacher Select.	Instr. Contl.	Acctg. Reqmt.	Clim. Index	Client Monit.	Hierarch. Control	Lay Influence	Facul Infl.
School Sec														
Public	-			.10	.80*	-.20	-.26*	-.25	.22	-.12	.12	-.18	.51*	-.50*
Religious		-		.09	-.50*	.46*	.36*	.15	.08	.27*	.16	.12	-.12	.05
Indep.			-	-.25*	-.44*	-.31*	-.10	.15	-.40*	-.17	-.37*	.10	-.54*	.61*
Percent Min	.04	-.02	-.02	-	.23	.30*	.11	.15	.24	.01	.29*	-.22	.34*	-.24
Total Enroll	.45*	-.26	-.28*	.14	-	-.02	-.09	-.04	.37*	.07	.36*	-.26*	.42*	-.31*
Goal Diffus.	-.53*	.53*	-.03	-.07	-.26*	-	.56*	-.04	.33*	.55*	.35*	-.12	.24	-.20
Teacher Sel.	-.45*	.41*	.03	.09	-.10	.36*	-	-.17	.16	.17	.26*	-.15	.14	-.05
Instr. Contl	0	-.07	.12	.11	-.05	.22*	.17*	-	.11	.26*	.08	.18	-.25	.15
Acctg Reqmt	.19	.03	-.34*	.08	.36*	.04	.01	-.04	-	.19	.80*	-.02	.09	-.11
Climate	-.27*	.29*	-.06	-.20*	-.03	.42*	.18*	.10	-.09	-	.24	.21	-.05	-.12
Client Mon	-.09	.22*	-.22*	.01	.10	.28*	.11	.06	.71*	0	-	.14	.08	.02
Hierar. Cntl	-.50*	.58*	-.17*	-.06	-.12	.33*	.23*	.05	-.03	.12	.15	-	-.63*	-.08
Lay Infl.	.59*	-.61*	.07	.05	.17*	-.37*	-.22*	-.03	.06	-.18*	-.11	-.82*	-	-.73*
Faculty Infl	-.09	-.02	.17*	-.03	.06	.04	-.05	-.04	-.04	.07	-.08	-.40*	-.19*	-

1 Primary Schools N = 125
2 Secondary Schools N = 37
3 Matrix for primary schools below the diagonal; matrix for secondary schools above the diagonol.

TABLE 3

Assessment of Organizational Distinctness of
Public, Religious and Independent School Sectors*
Primary Schools Only

Generalized Squared Distance to Schooltype

From School Type	Public	Religious	Non-religious Independent
Public	20.05	29.46	31.54
Religious	28.49	19.90	31.99
Non-religious Independent	25.54	23.85	23.29

Number of observations (and %) Classified into School Type

From School Type	Public	Religious	Non-religious Independent	Total
Public	37(84.1%)	5(11.4%)	2(4.6%)	44(100%)
Religious	3(4.4%)	66(95.7%)	0	69(100%)
Non-religious Independent	0	1(7.1%)	13(92.9%)	14(100%)
Total	40(31.5%)	72(56.7%)	15(11.8%)	127(100%)
Prior probability set	.347	.543	.110	

*Based on discriminant analysis including the school sector variables and organizational indices (goal diffuseness, teacher selectivity, instructional control, accounting requirements, climate index, climate monitoring, hierarchical control and lay influence). Within covariance matrices used (test of homogeneity of matrices yielded chi square value of .07).

Table 4

Correlations Among Organizational Indices According to their Representation in the Three Sectors - Primary Schools Only*.

All Three Sectors:	Accounting requirements with client monitoring (Public .67; Religious .75; Independent .74).
	Hierarchical Control with Lay Influence (-.63, -.78; -.83, respectively).
Public and Religious:	Goal diffuseness and climate (.57 and .24, respectively).
	Instructional Contrl and goal diffuseness (.31 and .28).
Public and Independent:	None
Religious and Independent:	Goal diffuseness and client monitoring (.25 and .64,respectively).
	Hierarchical Control and Faculty Influence (-.65 and -.62).
Public Only:	Instructional Control and Climate (.40).
	Teacher Selectivity and Accounting Requirements (.37).
	Lay Influence and Faculty Influence (-.70).
Religious Only:	Teacher Selectivity and Instructional Control (.30).
Independent Only:	Hierarchical Control and Instructional Control (.55).

*This assessment is based on three correlation matrices: for public schools (N = 44), religious schools (N = 69), and independent non-religious schools (N = 14). Only correlations statistically significant at the .05 level are reported.

TABLE 5

Correlations of School Climate Index with Organizational Variables by Sector -

Primary Schools Only

Organizational Variable	Public	Religious[1]	Independent Non-religious
Goal diffuseness	.57*	.24*	.26
Teacher selectivity	.01	.05	.03
Instructional Control	.40*	-.02	-.17
Accounting Requirements	.06	-.19	-.09
Client Monitoring	-.08	-.04	.18
Hierarchical Control	.03	.03	-.23
Lay Influence	-.14	.09	.00
Faculty Influence	.15	-.15	.41
Size	-.02	.11/.34	.62*
Minority (%)	-.12	-.26*/.18	-.66*

1 Correlations with size and percent minority are shown separately for parochial and religious independent schools, respectively.

*Indicates correlation statistically significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 6

Regression Analysis of School Climate Index
for Primary and Secondary Schools Separately.

	Primary Schools			Secondary Schools		
Variables Analyzed	b	B	F	b	B	F
Organizational Factors:						
Goal Diffuseness	.262	.412	17.84	.375	.659	23.82
Teacher Selectivity	-	-	-	-	-	-
Instructional Control	-	-	-	.411	.286	4.64
Accounting Requirements	-	-	-	-	-	-
Client Monitoring	-.131	-.163	3.68	-	-	-
Hierarchical Control	-	-	-	.066	.239	3.04
Lay Influence	-	-	-	-	-	-
Compositional Factors:						
Total Enrollment(1,000)	.972	.158	3.38	.305	.212	2.47
Percent Minority	-.006	-.185	5.30	-.009	-.231	2.63
Sector						
Public	-	-	-	-	-	-
Religious	.284	.148	2.40	-	-	-
Independent	-	-	-	-	-	-
N_2	125			37		
R^2	.25		7.81	.50		6.14

APPENDIX I

SAMPLE RESPONSE BIAS

Our strategy for assessing potential biasing effects of high non-response rates entailed 1) comparing means and standard deviations on basic school, personnel and student composition variables for respondent schools and non-respondent schools in the sample populations (broken down by sector and by grade level)[1] and 2) observing correlations of variables for which differences were noted with variables of interest to our analysis.

Table 1 shows results of the respondent-population (net respondents) comparisons. Statistical tests are not done, since we are not comparing two independent samples; we consider as significant any difference greater than 10 percent of the level shown for the non-respondent population.

Respondent schools in the public primary sector show larger district contexts and have smaller minority enrollments than expected; while secondary public school respondents are larger and also have smaller minority enrollments.

The parochial primary school respondents are in larger districts and have larger minority enrollments than the sample population respondents. Ns for secondary schools in this sector are so small (4 and 7 respectively) that analysis is not warranted.

The religious primary and secondary respondent schools are smaller than population non-respondents; and the primary schools are in larger district contexts. Non-religious primary school respondents are larger and from larger districts than the rest of the sample population.

These differences are of concern as they relate to variables of interest to our analysis. Sector-specific correlations of school size,

[1] The sets of variables compared differ across sector according to data availability. The only measure of student composition available for all sectors is percent minority.

district size, and minority enrollment (as they distinguished respondent schools from their populations) with our research variables are shown in Table 2. Results are reported for primary schools only, since small sample sizes for parochial and independent private secondary schools preclude sector comparisons.

The patterns of correlations are summarized in Table 3 and particular biases in our estimates on sector tendencies, based on respondent samples, are inferred. This assessment suggests only directions for correction of estimates from our data. Our initial detailed analysis of sector means takes the likely biases into account in assessing sector contrasts (see the "+" and "-" notations in Table 1, indicating direction of correction for bias). Importantly, none of the sector contrasts noted would be altered by suggested corrections of means.

APPENDIX I

TABLE 1

Means on Selected Variables for Respondent and Non-respondent Population Schools by Sector and Grade Level

	PUBLIC				PAROCHIAL		INDEPENDENT PRIVATE					
	ELEMENTARY		SECONDARY		ELEMENTARY		RELIGIOUS				NON-RELIGIOUS	
							ELEMENTARY		SECONDARY		ELEMENTARY	
	R	NRP	R	NRP	R	NRP	R	NRP	R	NRP	R	NRP
Social Size and District Context												
School enrollment												
Mean	394	404	1630*	1415	296	310	139*	173	369*	565	217*	127
S D	173	163	478	675	84	110	53	119	393	364	133	93
N[1]	62	775	41	101	67	82	14	81	9	22	18	65
District enrollment												
Mean	18,029*	20,424	19327	19004	25,932*	29,575	23,908*	21,006	28,075	28,038	27,060*	21,767
SD	9207	18,281	17158	16147	20,570	23,823	22,154	19,437	24,176	20,735	26,296	22,374
N	57	742	41	100	64	80	14	79	9	22	18	65
Personnel												
Aides (*)												
Mean	9.0	9.4	9.6*	7.3								
SD	5.8	7.1	10.7	6.5								
N	62	773	39	100								
Certified Personnel (*)												
Mean					10.6	11.0						
SD					2.6	3.4						
N					65	78						

47

Continued.....

APPENDIX I

TABLE 1 Cont'd

	PUBLIC				PAROCHIAL		INDEPENDENT				PRIVATE NON-RELIGIOUS	
	ELEMENTARY		SECONDARY		ELEMENTARY		RELIGIOUS ELEMENTARY		SECONDARY		ELEMENTARY	
	R	NRP	R	NRP	R	NRP	R	NRP	R	NRP	R	NRP
Teachers (*)												
Mean							9.7*	11.8	24.6*	34.5	20.7*	12.7
SD							4.0	8.5	17.6	15.0	13.0	7.9
N							13	81	9	22	18	65
Student Composition												
Minority (%)												
Mean	30%*	44%	35%*	40	30%	6%	42%	N.A.	-	N.A.	28%	N.A
SD	21	30	29	29	34	17	30		-		19	N.A,
N	62	773	39	100	67	77	14	-	-	-	18	-
Programs for handicapped												
Mean							0	.1	0	.0	.1	.4
SD							0	.3	0	0	.3	1.0
N							13	81	9	22	18	65

55

1 N's vary with data availability 2 Ns for secondary parochial and non-religious primary are too small

* Indicates Respondent level departing more than 10 per cent from non respondent public.

56

APPENDIX I

TABLE 2

Correlations of Respondent Bias Variables with Research Variables for Primary Schools by Sector.*

Study Variables	PUBLIC Dist. Enrol. (N =62)	PUBLIC % Minority (N= 62)	PAROCHIAL Dist Enrol. (N = 62)	PAROCHIAL % Minor. (N =65)	INDEPENDENT Relig. School N = 14	INDEPENDENT Relig. Enrol. Dist	PRIVATE Non-Relig. Enrol. Schl	PRIVATE Non-Relig. Enr. Dist Enrl
Program Emphasis								
Diffuseness Index	-	-	-	-	.55	-	-	-
Prep Focus	-	-.25	-.28	-	-	-	-	-
Trad. Focus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Progressive Focus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Organizational Emphasis								
Climate Index	-	-	-.27	-.27	-	-	.62	-
Course Offerings	-	-.33	-	-	-	-	-	-
Internal	-	-	-	-	-	-	.56	-
External	-	-.31	-.48	-.40	-	-	.57	-
Selection Criteria								
Teachers								
Selectivity Index	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rat/Legal	-.28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moral	-	-	-	-	.66	-	-	-
Professional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ascribed (Aff Action)	-	-	.34	-	-	-	-	-
Students								
Selectivity Index			-	-	-	-	-	-
Academic			-	-	-	-	-	-
Moral			-	-	-	-	-	-
Personal/Social			-	-	-	-	.60	-
Particularistic			-	-	-	-	-	-
Ascribed (Aff Action)			-	-	.54	-	-	-

Continued....

APPENDIX I

TABLE 2 (Cont'd)

Correlations of Respondent Bias Variables with Research Variables for Primary Schools by Sector.

Study Variables	PUBLIC Inst Enrol. (N =62)	PUBLIC % Minority (N= 62)	PAROCHIAL Dist Enrol. (N = 62)	PAROCHIAL % Minor. (N =65)	INDEPENDENT Relig. School N = 14	INDEPENDENT Relig. Enrol. Dist	PRIVATE Non-Relig. Schl Enr.	PRIVATE Non-Relig. Dist En
Instructional Control								
Extent External control	.29	-	-	-	-	-	-	.51
Methods	-	.38	-	-	-	-	-	-
Curriculum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Student Progress	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Student Dismissal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.57
Head Involvement	-	-		.31	-	-	.61	-
Information System								
External control Index	-	-	-	-	.58	-	-	-
Ach. test reporting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Student Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Climate monitoring	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teacher performance	-	-	-	-	.78	-	-	-
Locus of decision making								
Complexity (total)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Admin (ratio)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Board (ratio)	-	-	-	-	-	.71	-	-
Pastor(ratio)	-	-	-	-.30	-	-	-	-
Principal (ratio)	-	-	.30	-	-	-	-	-
Faculty (ratio)	-	-	-	-	-	.66	-	-
Parents	-	-.29	-	-	-	-	-	-
								-

* Only correlations statistically significant at the .05 level are reported.

TABLE 3-I

ASSESSMENTS OF BIAS ASSOCIATED WITH SURVEY RESPONSE PATTERNS

PRIMARY SCHOOLS ONLY

SECTOR	FEATURES DISTINGHISHING RESPONDENTS FROM SCHOOL POPULATION	CORRELATES	INFERRED BIAS*
PUBLIC	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT (LOWER FOR RESPONDENTS)	Teacher selection - rational/legal (-.28)	Sample overestimates use of rational-legal criteria of teacher selection
		Extent Instructional control (+.29)	Sample underestimates extent of instructional control.
		Curriculum decision complexity (-.29).	Sample overestimates complexity of curriculum decision.
	MINORITY ENROLLMENT (LOWER FOR RESPONDENTS)	Program emphasis on preparation (-.25)	Sample overestimates schools' preparatory focus.
		Organizational emphasis on external support (-.31)	Sample overestimates Schools' emphasis on external support and on course offerings.
		Organizational emphasis on course offerings (-.33)	
		Control of Instructional method (+.38)	Sample underestimates schools' control of instructional methods.
		Ratio of parent influence in decision making (-.29)	Sample overestimates parents' influence in decision making.
PAROCHIAL	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT (LOWER FOR RESPONDENTS)	Program emphasis on preparation (-.28)	Sample overestimates schools' preparatory focus.
		Climate Index (-.27)	(Sample overestimates overall support
		Organizational emphasis on external support (-.40)	and external support).
		Teacher selection - affirmative action (.34)	Sample underestimates Use of affirmative action standards in teacher hiring
		Ratio of heads influence in decision-making(.30)	Sample underestimates heads influence in decision making, and faculty influence over budgetary decisions.
		Ratio of faculty influence in budgetary decisions (.24).	

Cont'd

TABLE 3-2

ASSESSMENTS OF BIAS ASSOCIATED WITH SURVEY RESPONSE PATTERNS

PRIMARY SCHOOLS ONLY

SECTOR	FEATURES DISTINGUISHING RESPONDENTS FROM SCHOOL POPULATION	CORRELATES	INFERRED BIAS*
	MINORITY ENROLLMENT (HIGHER FOR RESPONDENTS)	Climate Index (-.27) Organizational emphasis on external support (-.48).	(Sample underestimates overall school support and external support).
		Instructional control through student dismissal (.31).	Sample overestimates use use of student dismissal
		Ratio of pastor influence in decision-making (-.30)	Sample underestimates pastor influence in decision-making.
RELIGIOUS PRIVATE	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT (LOWER FOR RESPONDENTS)	Goal Diffuseness Index (.55)	Sample underestimates Schools' goal diffuseness.
		Teacher selection moral criteria (.66)	Sample underestimates use of moral criteria for teacher selection and affirmative action for student selection.
		Student selection Affirmative action (.54).	
		Accounting requirements index (.58)	Sample underestimates external control of schools and their information on teacher performance.
		Information on teacher performance(.78)	
	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT (HIGHER FOR RESPONDENTS)	Ratio board influence in decision making(-.71)	Sample underestimates board influence in decision making and over-estimates faculty influence.
		Ratio faculty influence in decision making(.66).	
		Ratio external control of budget decisions(-.70)	Sample underestimates external control of budget decisions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3 - 3

ASSESSMENTS OF BIAS ASSOCIATED WITH SURVEY RESPONSE PATTERNS

PRIMARY SCHOOLS ONLY

SECTOR	FEATURES DISTINGHISHING RESPONDENTS FROM SCHOOL POPULATION	CORRELATES	INFERRED BIAS*
NON-RELIGIOUS PRIVATE	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT (HIGHER FOR RESPONDENTS)	Climate Index (.62) Organization emphasis on internal support (.56) Organization emphasis on external support (.57)	Sample overestimates overall support, both internal and external.
		Student selection academic criteria (.60)	Sample overestimates use of academic criteria for student admission and reliance on student dismissal.
		Instructional control through student dismissal (.61).	
	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT (HIGHER FOR RESPONDENTS)	Extent instructional control (-.51)	Sample underestimates extent of instructional control especially monitoring of student progress.
		Student progress monitoring (-.57).	

*Parenthesis ( ) indicate that the inferred bias is probably incorrect, since bias in the opposite direction is suggested by another feature distinguishing the respondents from non-respondents.

APPENDIX II

DATA PREPARATION WORK

The preparation of the data for analysis included correcting classification errors, identifying and correcting id numbers on the survey files and the various external data source files, correcting coding errors, finding additional information to replace missing data, and identifying keypunch errors.

In order to ease the reporting burden on schools, information which was believed to be available from external sources was not asked on the surveys. This resulted in three different survey forms for the public, private and Catholic schools. External sources of information used were the public School Information Form, private school affidavits, and survey forms from the San Francisco, San Jose and Oakland dioceses. These form the SIF, private affidavit, and Catholic Hardcopy files respectively. The diocesan surveys were in three different formats. Information asked was not consistent across forms, reducing the number of variables available for analysis.

Classification

The schools on the survey, SIF, private affidavit and Catholic hardcopy files were compared to the 1981 California Directory of Public Schools, the 1981 California Private School Directory (which includes Catholic schools) and the 1982 Catholic Directory. Information for one Catholic school was added to the Catholic Hardcopy file. Four public schools were added to the SIF file. Fifteen non-Bay Area schools were deleted from the private affidavit file. Three schools were transferred from the private affidavit file to the Catholic hardcopy file. As a result, the files contain the population of schools in the six county Bay Area.

It was decided to eliminate vocational, continuation and handicapped schools from this project, assuming that their school organization would be atypical. This resulted in a loss of 51 schools from the SIF file and six schools from the public survey file.

The Catholic schools were divided between the Catholic and private files, according to their organization. Diocesan and parochial schools were classified in the Catholic file, since they are part of a diocesan school system. Although it is not as tightly coupled as the public school system, the diocese provides support services and assistance to the parochial and diocesan schools as well as formulating policies and guidelines. While individual schools are more free than comparable public schools to differ from diocesan policy, the existence of policies provides more localized homogeneity than the Catholic private schools have. The schools classified as private schools in the 1982 Catholic Directory were classified into the private file. Eight schools in the survey were found to be misclassified according to these criteria. Four were transferred from the private to the Catholic file and four were transferred the other direction. One parochial school returned both a private and a Catholic survey; it was eliminated from the private survey file.

Our project redefined the grade level variable used to classify schools as elementary or secondary. Since it was unclear whether middle schools would follow elementary or secondary patterns of organization, they were excluded from either classification. Elementary schools were defined as any combination of grades K through 9 with no grade over 9, with the exception of middle schools containing only some or all of grades 7 through 9. Schools that included a combination of grades 7 through 12 but no grade less than 7 were defined as secondary, with middle schools again excluded. Schools that included

grades 10 or above and grades 6 or below were classified as combined elementary/secondary.

File Merging

Most of the problems in merging the survey files with the appropriate external file came from mismatched ID numbers. The use of tapes from external sources resulted in the lack of a common ID number for schools returning private and public surveys. A bridging file of ID numbers was constructed. Confusion over construction of IFG ID numbers resulted in a difference between the survey and bridging ID numbers for 30 public, 18 private and twelve Catholic schools. In addition, six schools on the Catholic survey or Catholic hard-copy files had mismatched ID numbers, mainly from keypunch errors.

Three schools on the private affidavit and bridging files had common school names and cities, but differing ID numbers. Grade spans in the survey and affidavit files were compared. The two schools which had the same grade span in both files had the ID on the bridging file changed. The school that had differing grade spans was eliminated from the affidavit file and minimal information was added from the California Private School Directory. Private schools with multiple campuses were listed separately on the affidavit file but singularly on the survey file. The multiple listings on the affidavit file were eliminated to match the survey.

Coding

Many items on the survey were dichotomous items where the respondent checked an item if it was relevant and left it blank if it was not. When these items were keypunched, blanks were recorded as missing data. This was corrected for variables representing admissions criteria, areas of school emphasis, practices contributing to school success, teacher hiring criteria, and data collection practices and requirements. If all items within a group were unchecked, then the items remained coded as missing information. Otherwise, they were coded as not relevant.

Missing Variables

Some missing data (e.g. grade spans, enrollments, staffing variables) were replaced either from other sources or from calculations based on available data. Other data were supplied based on logical deductions from available data. For example, some schools reported being accredited by a particular accrediting agency but did not report being accredited.

CODING DECISIONS

I. All files

A. Dichotomous variables

The following were coded as missing if items were not checked. If all items within a group were unchecked, we assumed that that group of items was skipped and coded items in that group as missing. Otherwise, unchecked items were coded to zero while checked items remained coded to '1'.

1. Admissions criteria V68 - V78
2. Areas of school emphasis V82-V90
3. Practices contributing to school success V91-V101
4. Teacher hiring criteria V103-V114
5. Data collection practices and requirements V151 - V168

B. Influence variables

Schools did not always indicate the influence of all groups for a given policy. This pattern did not appear to be random, but seemed to indicate no influence. Therefore, missing ratings were coded to the lowest influence category unless the ratings for all groups were missing for a specific policy.

C. Data collection variables

Several schools reported that data was required to be collected, but not that they collected it. Since they did not report collecting <u>any</u> required data, information reported as being required to be collected was coded in the raw data as being collected. (See the Gilliland summary for identification of specific schools).

D. Accreditation

If schools reported being accredited by a specific agency but did not indicate that they were accredited, the raw data was changed to reflect their accreditation. (Again, see the Gilliland summary for specific schools)

E. Definition of grade level variable

Since our study was concerned with school organization, we separated elementary and secondary schools. Elementary was defined as any combination of grades K through 9 with no grade over 9, with the exception of middle schools containing some or all of grades 7 through 9 alone. Schools that included a combination of grades 7 through 12 but no grade less than 7 were defined as secondary, with middle schools again excluded. Schools that included grades 10 or above and grades 6 or below were classified as combined elementary/secondary.

F. Missing data and keypunch errors

Some missing data was added in by the Scott subproject through calculations from other data and from external sources. In addition, some keypunch errors were identified. (Note: Several multi-digit keypunch errors were found, making it unlikely that the keypunching was verified when it was punched). See Gilliland summary for details.

G. ID numbers

The second digit in the idnumbers of 30 public schools, 18 private schools and 12 Catholic schools were changed to match idnumbers on the bridging file.

II. Public schools

A. Elimination of vocational, continuation and handicapped schools

51 specialized schools were eliminated from the file of all public schools and 6 schools were eliminated from the survey file. The idnumbers of those eliminated from the survey were: 10539, 10540, 10542, 10553, 10566, and 10045. The rationale was that their organization was not likely to be typical.

B. Schools added to general file

Cdsco	Cdsdist	Cdssch	Totenr	Grade	Grdspan	Schnam
1	61259	6094734	135	1	K-6	Arts School, Oakland
38	68478	6072037	505	1	K-5	Paul Revere Annex, SF
43	69401	433472	1968	2	9-12	Leigh High, SJ
43	69666	6060099	1069	.	7-9	Harte Jr. Hi, SJ

C. Added information on schools in survey:

Schoolid	Grdspan	Grade	Totenr	Schnam
10148	912	2	1442	Santa Clara Hi
10149	912	2	1547	Santa Clara H.S.
10232	7 8	.	700	Buchser Jr. Hi, SJ

III. Private Schools

A. Elimination of parochial and diocesan schools

All parochial and diocesan schools were originally on the private affadavit file and were eliminated. Four parochial schools were transferred to the Catholic survey file from the private survey file:

Schoolid	Schname
20111	St. Anthony's Elementary
20114	Sacred Heart Grammar, SF
20164*	St. Francis Cabrini
30226	St. Elizabeth's , Oakland

*20037 on the Catholic file

B. Elimination of duplicate school

St. Leonard's, Fremont (schoolid #30222 on private file) was eliminated. It returned both the private and Catholic surveys. Since it is a parochial school, it was retained in the Catholic school file.

C. Elimination of non-Bay Area schools

Fifteen non- Bay area schools were eliminated from the private survey file:

30202, 30203, 30207, 30210, 30220, 30227, 30228, 30206, 30212, 30216, 30217, 30221, 30205, 30223, and 30218.

D. Addition of private schools to survey file

Four schools were transferred from the Catholic file

20056 Salesian H.S., Richmond
20092 Immaculate Conception Academy, SF
20177 St. Francis H.S., MV
20002 St. Joseph's Notre Dame H.S.

E. Schools with same name, different CDS numbers

Three schools had the same name but different CDS numbers on the survey and affidavit files. Grade spans were checked. Two schools had the same grade span on both files: Fr. Am. Bilingual, SF
Sunnyvale.Christian High, MV
The CDS number on the survey file was changed to match that on the affidavit file for these schools.

One school had different grade spans: San Jose Christian, Campbell. The information on the private affidavit file was dropped, and minimal information from the California Private School Directory was added.

F. Dropping and adding schools from the affidavit file

Three schools were dropped from the affidavit file:

CDSSCH	Schnam
6913131	Redwood Christian School - Redwood Campus, Castro Valley
6995450	Redwood Christian School - Crossroads Campus, Castro Valley
4340105	San Jose Christian, Campbell

The Redwood Christian Schools are two campuses of a school returning a single survey. The San Jose Christian School had changed grade levels from 6-12 to K-12.

Minimal information was added on schools in the survey file but missing from the affidavit file.

Cdssch	Schoolid	Grdspan	Grade	Totenr	Relig	Schnam, City
140376	30011	K-12	3	1102	2	Redwood Christian, Castro Valley
6972832	30032	K-8	1	126	2	Redeemer Luth, Oakland
4340105	30141	K-12	3	206	2	San Jose Christ., Camp
6979413	30155	K-8	1	508	1	Pinewood Pvt. Schl. of Los Altos

G. Addition of missing data

Schoolid	Totenr	Grdspan	Grade	Schnam
30139	86			True Learning Ctr.,RWC
30011	1102	K-12	3	Redwood Christian, Castro Valley
30032	126	K-8	1	Redeemer Luth., Oakland
30113	396	K-12	3	Fr. Am. Bilingual
30141	206	K-12	3	San Jose Christian, Campbell
30155	508	K-8	1	Pinewood Pvt. Schl of Los Altos
30178	485	K-12	3	Sunnyvale Christian Hi

IV. Catholic Schools

A. Elimination of private schools

Four private schools (according the The Catholic Directory, 1982) from the survey file (20056, 20092, 20177 and 20002) and 29 from the Catholic hardcopy file were eliminated.

B. Transfer of parochial schools from private files

Four schools were transferred from the private survey file:

20111 St. Anthony's Elem
20114 Sacred Heart Grammar, SF
20164 St. Francis Cabrini
20037 St. Elizabeth's Oakland

Three schools were transferred from the private affidavit file:

Cdssch	grade	Schnam
6979389	1	St. Elizabeth Seton Catholic Community,PA
6979470	1	St. Elizabeth Seton Catholic Community, PA
4340642	1	St. Lawrence Elem.

C. Addition of school

One school was added to the general file:

Schoolid	Cdsco	Cdsdist	Cdssch	totenr	grade	schnam
20194	38	68478	6981278	566	1	Holy Name Elem., SF

D. Correction of ID numbers:

Schoolid	Cdssch	TO	Schoolid	Cdsco
20110				38
	6978928		20150	
20138				41
	3845245		20088	
	6978928		20026	
	6981568		20113	

E. Addition of missing data

Schoolid	Totenr	Schnam
20183	291	St. Joseph's
20170	1093	Archbishop Mitty High School
20039	996	Bishop O'Down High School